



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Further Notes on the So-Called Epic of Paradise.*—By J. DYNELAY PRINCE, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

In JAOS 36, pp. 140-145, Dr. Stephen H. Langdon has criticised my review (*ibid.* pp. 90-114) of his 'Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and Fall of Man,' and seeks by means of text corrections to maintain his thesis that his document contains a description of Paradise, the ejection of mankind by a flood, and the deliverance of a certain pious person who became an agriculturist and was eventually cursed by the god Enki.

Accepting many of Dr. Langdon's textual emendations—it is still impossible to see how he has altered my interpretation of the text as a whole. He may show that the cassia plant was not the death-plant and, as will appear from the following review of his criticisms, he may have improved the lucidity of the text in places, but he has certainly not broken down the interpretation of the crucial Obv. i., describing the condition of the land as a waste place desolated by drought instead of, as he believes, a Paradise on earth. Upon this first column the correct understanding of the entire poem depends.

Through the courtesy of Dr. Jastrow, I have been able to comment on some of his and Dr. Chiera's emendations, based upon their recent collation of the text.

#### OBVERSE

##### I.

1) *e-ne-ba-ám* I rendered 'they that are cut off,' understanding the verb-root to be *ba* + the suffix *ám*. This seems to me a still possible translation, but, even if we regard *e-ne* as the verb-stem = *calálu* and *ba-ám* as the suffix, the interpretation remains the same; viz., 'they that have ceased, they that have ceased are ye'; note IV. R. 13 b, 39: *ú-ba-ra-e-ne* = *la aclalu* 'I shall not cease.' The people of the land have ceased to exist.

17) Langdon: *nu-ub-zu* (vice *-ba*). If accepted, I render: 'the dog knows no longer the crouching kids,' i. e. does not recognize them, because there are neither dogs nor kids!

18) L. reads DUN = some sort of bovine animal, 'zebu (?).' Render: 'the DUN (?) knows no longer how to eat the grain.' It is not necessary to assume the idea 'cohabit' for *zu*, a sense, which, by the bye, need not be regarded as 'obscene' (L.). On the other hand if L.'s original *ba* (for *zu*) be retained, *ba* = *našaru*, 'tear': 'the dog no longer tears the kids' (Jastrow). I prefer *zu*, as this makes better sense in connection with the cattle eating grain.

19) Obscure, but in the general sense showing the absence of life: *nu-mu-un-su* (L. *su*, better than *zu*) *dim-ur-ra* can hardly mean 'grown-up offspring,' but merely 'offspring'; *nu-mu-un-su* means 'seed of the body' (*su*). L.: 'fondling of the lap' (?) = *dim-ur-ra* (?).

28) *libir-e X-e nu-mu-nigin*. L. reads the unknown sign X as *zag* = *pirištu*, *nimequ* 'wisdom,' or = *rēmu* 'mercy.' It cannot possibly mean 'mercy' here. If this be admitted, the line may be rendered: 'the *libir* no longer turns (*nigin*) to wisdom,' i. e. officials no longer perform their function, because they do not exist.

30) L.: *zag eri-ka i-lu* (DIB vice KU) *nu-mu-ni-bi*, and translates: 'in the sanctuary of the city, alas (*i-lu*) they said not,' but this really means: 'the decree (*zag*) of the city is accepted no longer, they say'; DIB = *cabâtu* which can mean 'accept.' That is, city ordinances have no longer any weight, as there are no more cities. All government has ceased. Jastrow denies the *zag*-sign here, and reads *i-lu* as *i-dur* (KU) = *nubbû* 'they lament' (?).

31) Chiera states *a-a-ni* is correct.

#### OBVERSE

#### II.

16) Untranslated before. L.: *a-šag a-gar ab-sim-a-ni še-mu-na*, 'the fields and meadows their vegetation (yielded in abundance).' Accepting this and reading 'shall yield,' it is in harmony with the rest of the passage, showing the beneficent nature of the flood.

31) L.: <sup>d</sup>*En-ki-ge za* (vice *a*) <sup>d</sup>*Dam-gal-nun-na*, 'Enki by the side of (= with) Damgalnunna.' Jastrow thinks *a* is certain, and objects to *za* as a preposition before the noun, but preposi-

tions exist in Sumerian (cp. HT. p. 141); in fact  $\hat{a}$  (*a-a*) = 'by the side of.'

OBVERSE

III.

4, 5, 7, 8, 24, 25 L. reads: *nu-mu-un-su-ub-bi* 'the sinless seed,' vice *nu-mu-un-zu ub-bi* 'as thy seed revere him.' This makes no essential change.

12, 32 L.: *gibil im-ma-an-su-ub*, vice *-te(g)*. This can mean 'with fire he purified (the ship).'

27, 28 L.: *su-ub-bu-ma-ni*, '(the son of man, that pious one) whom he has declared pure'; perhaps better: 'whom he has purified.' This is in harmony with my general rendering, indicating the divine approbation of the favorite.

39) Langdon objects to my reading *Tag-gu* (KU) for the name of the favorite on the ground that the second sign in the name has two internal horizontals, which he claims must always indicate a *tug*-value. This theory is not substantiated by Barton, Thureau-Dangin, or Friedr. Delitzsch, all of whom make no phonetic difference between the square enclosure with one, two or three internal horizontals. It is not probable that the sign with two horizontals could not have the value *ku*. At the same time, it must be admitted that the phonetic value of this name is very obscure, but Langdon's association of his value *Tag-tug* with the *nâxu*-stem 'rest,' in order to connect the word with the Biblical Noah, is too far-fetched to seem possible. Jastrow denies the possibility of a name *Tag-tug* at all. It would have to be *Tag-tag* or *Tug-tug*. This is very probable.

42) L.: *gu ga-ra-ab-dúg* (vice *-ra-dúg*); render: 'I will say it (-b) to thee (*ra-*).'

REVERSE

I.

36) L.: *ne-in-si-si* (vice *mal-e*); render: 'in his seat (*úrra-ni*) he took his place (*si-si*).'

39) L.: *sukkal-na* (vice *é-na*); render: 'to his messenger he gave order.' Jastrow reads *sukkal-a-na*, a much better rendering grammatically but Chiera says *e* = BIT is sure!

41) L.: *ğul-RIM* (vice *ğul-si*), indicating some sort of plant; render: 'I, as gardener, planted (?) the *ğul-RIM* plant.'

42) L. objects to *šam-*, substituting probably *il*; render: 'I will appoint thee as *il*' (obscure). Note that *il* = *Ka-ka-si-ga*, perhaps 'mouth-giver' = 'agent, attorney' (?). Jastrow says *šam* is certain; if so, a better version.

48) L.: *si-gi* (vice his original *zi*). I also read *si-gi* (JAOS 36, p. 104).

## REVERSE

## II.

20) L.: *u-RIM* (vice *u-giš*); render: 'my king as to the *u-RIM* plant has decreed.' According to L. = *supalu*, *suplu* = *lardu*; *arantu* 'nard,' n. 1, p. 142.

35) L. corrects his translation regarding the cassia-plant which is apparently not the herb of death. Render: 'he may pluck it; he may eat it.'

37) L. inserts *En-ki* and reads *sig* (vice *di*); render: '*Enki* placed therein the plant whose fate he had determined.' This seems correct. Then follows the curse, but there is no statement that any forbidden plant has been eaten! In fact, the reason of the curse is not given at all, which materially interferes with Langdon's idea as to the meaning of the text, and this by his own more recent reading, inserting the god-name *En-ki*.

37 and 38). Note the passage *i-de nam-ti-la en-na ba-ug-gi-a i-de ba-ra-an-bar-ri-en*, which L. renders: 'the face of life, until he dies, shall he not see.' If the word 'until' be retained, this makes no clear sense in English. Until he dies, he would be living and hence would be 'seeing the face of life,' which can only mean 'live.' This passage must, therefore, point to the time of the favorite's death. I still render *en-na ba-ug-gi-a*, 'when he dies,' indicating that at the time of his death he shall not see life, i. e. have no eternal life (JAOS 36, p. 93). The form *ba-ug-gi-a* with overhanging *-a* can mean only 'when he dies.' *En-na* undoubtedly means 'until' (Del., *Sum. Gr.*, p. 58), but it must be used here in the sense of an anticipative durative. It should be noted that, when *en-na* clearly means 'until,' it must be followed by *-š* in the verb-form (Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 58). We find a similar usage to this in the Slavonic languages, as in Russian *na búdushchi god*, lit., 'unto (until) next year,' which is commonly used in the simple sense 'next year,' by anticipation. It should be observed, however, that, even if

Langdon is right, this still does not change the general meaning of the text, which plainly prescribes a punishment for the favorite.

40) L.: *lul-a*, 'with woful cry'; better 'rebelliously' (= *sar-aru*).

44) L. strikes out the numeral two and reads *-a*, which was originally suggested by Jastrow; i. e. *uru-ma-a giš-mal ga-ri-du* (KAK) *mu-zu ġe-pad-da*. He is probably right in thinking that *giš-mal* = 'creature' and not 'throne' and, therefore, the lines should read: 'in my city a being I shall create for thee, and she shall call upon thy name.' Of course, this rendering depends on the correctness of *-a*, instead of 'two,' which is doubtful.

45) Render: . . . 'her head like the others is fashioned.'

46) Render: 'her foot like the others is designed.'

47) Render: 'her eye like the others is endowed with light.'

All this seems to refer to a female companion for the favorite, but the passage is very obscure.

These textual criticisms in no way insure the original interpretation of Dr. Langdon. The sense of Obv. Col. i., as already pointed out by me in JAOS 36, p. 90, still refers to a territory which had been practically destroyed by drought. This desolation is even more vividly described in lines 17 ff. by Langdon's recent corrections of the text! In Obv. ii., the prayer for water is answered more plainly in 16, translated for the first time by Langdon: showing how the fields and meadows yield richly. In Obv. iii., the special favorite is allotted to the goddess. As Langdon now has it, he is 'the pure seed; the purified one,' fit for divine service. Dr. Langdon's textual changes make no difference whatever in favor of a 'Paradise'-interpretation. He states that this is not a 'tendency' composition, as it has no refrains, yet an impartial student, reading the text in JAOS 36, pp. 95 ff., cannot fail to observe the evident antiphonies confirming the stereotyped character of the poem. This is further substantiated by the clearly deliberate arbitrary identification of god with god at the close and the constant submission to Enki (Ea) as supreme.